arXiv:1204.2729v2 [gr-qc] 15 May 2012

Comment on 'Black hole entropy and isolated horizon thermodynamics'

Abhishek Majhi
A.P.C.Division,
Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics,
Kolkata 700064, India

There is a deep underlying problem in the *model dependent* thermodynamic analysis of black holes shown in the above quoted paper. In this method one can only find out the canonical entropy of the black hole but *not* the microcanonical entropy. Besides this crucial issue a few other problems are also discussed.

I. INTRODUCTION

A recent paper [1] by A. Ghosh and A. Perez introduces a new idea of considering N, the total number of punctures on a quantum IH, as a new *quantum hair* for black hole based on the analogy with the total number of particles in case of ideal gas. But the implementation of the idea falls short of clarification at some places because this analogy with the ideal gas model is not so naive as it looks at first sight. A detailed analysis of [1] is given in the following sections.

II. PROBLEM WITH THE MODEL DEPENDENT APPROACH

The punctures on IH are considered to be a gas of topological defects obeying Maxwell Boltzmann statistics and the calculations shown in [1] are that of standard textbook statistical mechanics of Maxwell Boltzmann ideal gas [4]. But, how can one understand that this ideal gas model represents a black hole ? The authors provide this link by defining a local temperature (T_U) of the IH and argue that at this particular temperature their *model* represents a black hole. So, one should note that *in [1], the ideal gas model represents a black hole only at* $T = T_U$. Now, from basic knowledge of textbook statistical mechanics we all know that a microcanonical ensemble is defined by fixing the energy(E) and number of particles(N) of the system and the temperature(T) is only a derived quantity completely known in terms of the preassigned values of E and N. Thus, *external tuning of* T *is prohibited in microcanonical ensemble* (allowed only in canonical or grand canonical ensemble).

Now, in [1], what the authors do is that, they calculate all the thermodynamic quantities at arbitrary temperature T and then set $T = T_U$ to claim that their results explain the thermodynamics of black holes. This procedure is fine as long as one works in canonical or grand canonical ensemble where T can be tuned externally. But one can not work in the *microcanonical* ensemble in this procedure. The reason is very simple. We define a microcanonical ensemble by assigning fixed values to E and N. Thus, when we calculate T, it is a completely known value, T_{MC} say, in terms of the preassigned values of E and N. One does not have the choice to set $T = T_U$ to get the results for microcanonical ensemble of black holes. This is exactly the problem one would face while calculating microcanonical entropy of the black hole in the *model dependent* approach shown in [1].

Let us explain the problem more explicitly in the context of the original calculations of [1]. One defines a microcanonical ensemble by *a priori* assigning fixed values to the independent thermodynamic variables i.e. $\mathscr{A} = \bar{\mathscr{A}}$ and $N = \bar{N}$, say. Here $\mathscr{A} = A/8\pi\gamma\ell_p^2$ is the analog of E since $E = A/8\pi\ell$ [1]. λ and σ are Lagrange *undetermined* multipliers. A few steps of algebra show that, in [1], using eq.(12) in C_1 and finding $d\sigma/d\lambda$ from eq.(13), one can obtain $\bar{\mathscr{A}}/\bar{N} = -d\sigma/d\lambda = F(\lambda)$, say, for dominant configuration. In principle, λ can be *determined* in terms of the preassigned values $\bar{\mathscr{A}}$ and $\bar{N}$ i.e. $\lambda = F^{-1}(\bar{\mathscr{A}}/\bar{N}) = \bar{\lambda}$, say (it follows that σ also gets determined). There is thus no more room to 'fix' λ from other considerations pertaining to the Unruh temperature (T_U), etc. Hence, *there is no way to argue that the microcanonical ensemble of this ideal gas model represent the microcanonical ensemble of black holes.* The model dependent approach taken in [1]to describe black hole thermodynamics is only suitable for canonical and grand canonical ensembles. One can never calculate the microcanonical entropy of the *black hole* in this approach. The authors' claim of eq.(15) of [1]to be "microcanonical entropy" is *not* correct. Even then, if one tries to argue that eq.(15) of [1]is the microcanoical entropy of the black hole (i.e. microcanonical entropy of ideal gas at $T = T_U$), then $\mathscr{A}$ and N can only take values satisfying the relation $\mathscr{A}/N = F(2\pi\gamma)$ which contradicts the original idea of considering $\mathscr{A}$ and N as independent variables.

As a concluding remark to this issue, I would like to add that the crucial point to be emphasized is the understanding of the role of the Lagrange multipliers λ, σ and the thermodynamic variables $\mathscr{A}, N$ in different ensembles. As long as one is working in the *microcanonical* ensemble, $\mathscr{A} = \bar{\mathscr{A}}$ and $N = \bar{N}$ are just preassigned quantities (numbers) and the variables which get solved in terms of these numbers are the Lagrange multipliers λ and σ. Hence one has no room for the choice of the Lagrange multipliers in *microcanonical* ensemble. On the other hand, while working in the canonical (grand canonical) ensemble $\mathscr{A}(\mathscr{A}, N)$ are *not* preassigned quantities and choosing λ is allowed. Hence, all the problems discussed here about the method adopted in [1], arises solely due to misunderstanding the roles of Lagrange multipliers in different ensembles.

III. A FEW QUESTIONABLE FACTS

Apart from the two above points of contentions regarding [1], there are a few other questionable issues regarding some fundamental facts in [1]. These are discussed below :-

A. Definition of Energy

It is straightforward to show that the quantity E_r is an *unconserved* quantity which has been used in [1], in an approximate form, as the 'energy' associated with a local observer (proper distance ℓ from the horizon) in the black hole background. One may ask the simplest of questions : *how can the quantity E_r, given by eq. (7) of [1], hence E given by eq.(8) of [1], represent 'energy' in any sense ?* [Considering the importance of this definition of energy in [1], a detailed discussion on this issue is given in the Appendix.]

B. The Length Scale ℓ

A new length scale $\ell = 2(2M\epsilon)^{1/2}$ has to be introduced to obtain $E \propto A$, where M is the mass associated with the black hole spacetime which can vary for different black holes and ϵ is an arbitrary length scale satisfying $\epsilon \ll 2M$. Since there is no other information regarding ϵ in [1], it can be considered as a tuning parameter which should be tuned *by hand* for different M's in order to give ℓ the status of a fundamental constant of the quantum theory. This property of ℓ is in absolute contradiction with the characteristics of any other known fundamental constants in physics. Moreover, there is *only one* fundamental (constant) length scale in quantum gravity, the Planck length (ℓ_p). Hence, two questions may be posed : *1) Is ℓ another fundamental length scale of the quantum theory other than ℓ_p? 2) How can ℓ be a fundamental (constant) length scale of the theory while it depends on two quantities which themselves are not fundamental constants ?*

C. The Hamiltonian and its Spectrum

The use of the Hamiltonian operator in eq.(9) of [1] is not clearly justified. The eigenstates belong to the Hilbert space of the QIH, the boundary, and not to the bulk geometry of the black hole. So the Hamiltonian operator must belong to this boundary Hilbert space in order to act on those eigenstates. It has not been clearly specified in [1] whether it is bulk or boundary Hamiltonian. So, for the moment, we assume that $\hat{H}$ be the boundary Hamiltonian operator. But there is a deeper problem associated with the eigen value equation, i.e. eq.(9), which is discussed as follows. In LQG framework, the effective description of a quantum IH is given by Chern-Simons theory coupled to the punctures made by the bulk spin network with the IH which act as sources. Each puncture is labeled by a non-zero spin. The area spectrum associated with the quantum IH is given by $A = 8\pi\gamma\ell_p^2 \sum_l \sqrt{j_l(j_l+1)}$ where j_l is the spin associated with the lth puncture. It is the eigen value of the area operator acting on the eigen state of the quantum IH having spin configuration $\{j_1, j_2, ...\}$. Considering these facts, the eigen value equation given by eq.(9) of [1] seems to be quite confusing. Though the Hamiltonian operator $\hat{H}$ and the eigen state $|j_1, j_2, ...\rangle$ belong to the Hilbert space of the Chern Simons theory on the quantum IH, the energy eigen value contains a length scale ℓ, which is absent in the quantum theory of IH and even in LQG. Moreover, one has to go away from the horizon to define ℓ. It is not at all understandable that *how can the energy eigen value of a quantum IH depend on a length scale that characterizes something which does not belong to the quantum theory on IH ?*

D. Unbounded Area Spectrum

The area spectrum associated with the quantum IH is *correctly* given by

$$A_{\mathcal{S}} = 8\pi\gamma\ell_p^2 \sum_{j=1/2}^{k/2} s_j \sqrt{j(j+1)}$$

where one should note the crucial role played by k which defines an upper bound for the value of j. This k is level of the Chern Simons theory on the quantum IH and is proportional to the classical area of the IH. Hence, for a quantum IH having Chern Simons theory on it, the area eigen value has an upper bound. Thus the area operator associated with a quantum IH is a Dirac observable which allows one to write $\left[\widehat{H}, \widehat{A}_{\mathcal{S}}\right] = 0$. Unfortunately, this is not the case for an arbitrary surface ($\mathcal{S}'$) having no Chern Simons theory associated with it. Hence the area spectrum associated with that surface becomes unbounded from above.

$$A_{\mathcal{S}'} = 8\pi\gamma\ell_p^2 \sum_{j=1/2}^{\infty} s_j \sqrt{j(j+1)}$$

Thus, it can not be a Dirac observable. Hence $\left[\widehat{H}, \widehat{A}_{\mathcal{S}'}\right] \neq 0$. Hence it is a matter of utmost importance that, *what surface is being dealt with in [1]?. If it is the IH, then where does ℓ come from ?* ℓ comes into play if and only if the surface $r = 2M + \epsilon$ is dealt with, which does not have a Chern Simons theory associated with it. Then, *how will the authors justify the area of such a surface to be a Dirac observable ?*

A Final Comment :- Considering all the problems discussed here regarding the model dependent approach in [1], the authors' claim about the local thermodynamic stability of the quantum IH with energy spectrum linear in area, seems to be standing on a very weak ground. Since, the positive specific heat is only that of an ideal gas for arbitrary temperature T and that of a black hole at $T = T_U$, it seems more like a stability analysis of the ideal gas system rather than a black hole. *Despite all these facts, the major contribution of the Letter [1] is the introduction of the concept to consider N to be an independent 'hair' which can lead to further understanding of the physics of quantum black holes.*

Appendix A: Problem with Conservation of energy and first law

The authors refer to [3]for a detailed explanation on their definition of energy (ref. [9] of [1]). Hence, to understand the fallacies in this definition, one has to critically analyze the definition of energy in [3].

A local first law for black hole thermodynamics has been derived in the above quoted paper [3]applying Gauss' law to a conserved energy-momentum four current for a certain bounded region of spacetime. A close observation reveals that the calculation, if worked out correctly, actually leads to the usual first law of black hole thermodynamics. The local first law which has been reported in [3], results from some spurious calculations.

To understand the flaws, the derivation of the first law in [3]should be analyzed step by step. The problem arises when the conserved energy-momentum four current, given by $J^b = \delta T^b_a \chi^a$, is integrated over the time-like world-sheet ($W_{\mathscr{O}}$) of local observers $\mathscr{O}$ i.e. the RHS of the steps to go from eq.(15) to eq.(16) of [3]as follows :-

$$\int_{W_{\mathscr{O}}} J_b N^b = \int_{W_{\mathscr{O}}} \delta T_{ab} \chi^a N^b = \int_{W_{\mathscr{O}}} \parallel \chi \parallel \delta T_{ab} u^a N^b$$

where N^a = inward normal to $W_{\mathscr{O}}$, $u^a = \chi^a / \parallel \chi \parallel$ = four velocity of the class of local observers on $W_{\mathscr{O}}$. The above expression is further manipulated as

$$\int_{W_{\mathscr{O}}} \parallel \chi \parallel \delta T_{ab} u^a N^b \approx \parallel \chi \parallel \int_{W_{\mathscr{O}}} \delta T_{ab} u^a N^b$$

where $\parallel \chi \parallel$ is approximately constant up to first order in ℓ (an infinitesimal spatial length scale). Quite strangely, identifying $\int_{W_{\mathscr{O}}} \delta T_{ab} u^a N^b$ as δE (and using eq.(17) on the LHS of eq.(16)), eq.(18) is obtained which ultimately leads to the local first law with a scaled surface gravity $\bar{\kappa} = \kappa / \parallel \chi \parallel$ in eq.(19) of [3].

Now, $J^b = \delta T^b_a \chi^a$ being the *conserved* energy current vector, *the energy-flux associated with the class of observers* ($\mathscr{O}$) is given by $\delta E = \int_{W_{\mathscr{O}}} \delta T_{ab} \chi^a N^b$. On the other hand, the quantity $\int_{W_{\mathscr{O}}} \delta T_{ab} u^a N^b$ is NOT conserved simply because $\nabla_{[a} u_{b]} \neq 0$ and can not represent energy in general. The only way to interpret $\int_{W_{\mathscr{O}}} \delta T_{ab} u^a N^b$ as some kind of energy is to approximate $\parallel \chi \parallel$ (in the denominator of $u^a = \chi^a / \parallel \chi \parallel$) as constant and define

$$\int_{W_{\mathscr{O}}} \delta T_{ab} u^a N^b \approx \frac{1}{\parallel \chi \parallel} \int_{W_{\mathscr{O}}} \delta T_{ab} \chi^a N^b = \delta \bar{E} \quad (say)$$

This $\delta \bar{E} = \delta E / \parallel \chi \parallel$ is conserved since $\parallel \chi \parallel$ is constant by approximation. But this only leads to the equation $\delta \bar{E} = (\bar{\kappa}/8\pi)\delta A$ which is nothing but the usual first law of black hole thermodynamics with a scale factor $(1/ \parallel \chi \parallel)$ multiplied on both sides.

Hence, one can conclude that, either the local first law derived in [3]is only a scaling of the usual known first law, or, the quantity identified as 'δE' is not conserved . While the first conclusion implies *no new physics*, the second conclusion implies *incorrect physics.* There is no way to justify the local first law derived in [3]as something *new and correct simultaneously.*

The authors seem to be completely aware of this ambiguity which becomes clear from a sentence just after eq.(16) of [3]quoted as follows: *"Notice that the integral on the right is closely related to the energy-flux associated to the observers, which is equals to δE."* The authors use the phrase "*closely related to* " to identify $\int_{W_{\mathscr{O}}} \delta T_{ab} u^a N^b$ with δE, because these quantities are related by a scale factor and NOT '*equals to*' each other. To replace $\int_{W_{\mathscr{O}}} \delta T_{ab} u^a N^b$ by δE, the scale factor $1/ \parallel \chi \parallel$ has to be *removed by hand.* This is exactly what is done to the LHS of the equation $\delta \bar{E} = (\bar{\kappa}/8\pi)\delta A$ and the scale factor $1/ \parallel \chi \parallel$ on the RHS is retained, which ultimately leads to *the incorrect equation $\delta E = (\bar{\kappa}/8\pi)\delta A$ (eq.(19) of [3]) claimed to be the local first law for black hole thermodynamics.*

The major question that an alert reader of [3]would ask is that : $\delta E =$? The authors should have clearly specified by a mathematical equation rather than making a statement, that what exactly δE is according to their considerations. If $\delta E = \int_{W_{\mathscr{O}}} \delta T_{ab} u^a N^b$, then - *How can this unconserved quantity represent 'energy' in any sense ?* If it is $\delta E = \int_{W_{\mathscr{O}}} \delta T_{ab} \chi^a N^b$, the usual first law is obtained, then - *What is new in what has been derived ?*

Acknowledgment : I am very grateful to Prof. P. Majumdar for helpful discussions regarding these comments.

[1] A.Ghosh, A.Perez, *Phys.Rev.Lett.***107**, 241301 (2011); arXiv:1107.1320v2

[2] A. Majhi, *Stability of Quantum Isolated Horizon with Energy Spectrum Linear in Area*; arXiv:1112.3457v2

[3] E.Frodden, A.Ghosh and A.Perez, *A local first law for black hole thermodynamics*; arXiv:1110.4055v2 [gr-qc]

[4] R. K. Pathria, P. D. Beale, *Statistical Mechanics*; 3rd Edition, Elsevier